arXiv:1104.0810v2 [math.FA] 1 Oct 2012

EVERY HILBERT SPACE FRAME HAS A NAIMARK COMPLEMENT

PETER G. CASAZZA, MATT FICKUS, DUSTIN MIXON, JESSE PETERSON AND IHAR SMALYANAU

Abstract. Naimark complements for Hilbert space Parseval frames are one of the most fundamental and useful results in the field of frame theory. We will show actually all Hilbert space frames have Naimark complements which possess all the usual properties for Naimark complements of Parseval frames with one notable exception. Thus these complements can be used with regard to equiangular frames, restricted isometry property, fusion frames, etc. Along the way, we will correct a mistake in a recent fusion frame paper where chordal distances for Naimark complements are computed incorrectly.

1. Introduction

Naimark complements for Hilbert space Parseval frames are one of the most fundamental and useful results in the field (See, e.g. [8]).

Naimark's Theorem. *A family of vectors* $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is a Parseval frame for an* M*-dimensional Hilbert space* $\mathcal{H}_M$ *if and only if there is a Hilbert space* $\mathcal{K}_N \supseteq \mathcal{H}_M$ *with an orthonormal basis* $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *so that the orthogonal projection* $P : \mathcal{K}_N \to \mathcal{H}_M$ *satisfies* $Pe_n = f_n$ *for all* $n = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. *Moreover* $\{(I-P)e_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is a Parseval frame for an* $(M-N)$*-dimensional Hilbert space. We call such a frame the* **Naimark complement** *of* $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$.

It is known that many standard properties of a given Parseval frame carry over to the Naimark complement including

1. Equal norm
2. Equiangularity
3. Restricted isometry property (RIP)
4. Orthogonality

to list but a few. This makes Naimark's theorem useful for proving existence of frames, or constructing frames with specific properties given an existing one [2, 4, 10]. Also problems can often be reduced to special cases by switching to Naimark complements, for example the Paulsen problem [1]. Naimark's theorem is one of the most used theorems in frame theory.

In this paper we will show all frames, not just the Parseval case, have a natural Naimark complement. These generalized Naimark complements also carry many basic properties of the frame to the complement with one notable exception. Specifically, the lower frame bound of the Naimark complement may be quite different from the lower frame bound of the original frame. However, we calculate this lower frame bound exactly in terms of the eigenvalues of the frame operator of the original frame.

Fusion frames, originally called frames of subspaces [5], are a natural generalization of frames where we consider weighted subspaces in place of frame vectors. Fusion frames have have developed rapidly due to their application to problems in sensor networks and distributive processing just to name a few [3, 6]. The interested reader may see www.fusionframe.org and www.framerc.org for extensive literature on the subject. Given a tight fusion frame, [2] introduces the Naimark fusion frame; our concept of a generalized Naimark complement may be considered is this setting as well. Every fusion frame has a natural complementary Naimark fusion frame, and many properties of these Naimark fusion frames may also be derived from the original fusion frame. Recently, an incorrect calculation was made [2] while computing the chordal

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46C05 and 46C07 and 47A05 and 15A03.

Key words and phrases. Frame and Fusion Frame and Naimark Complement and RIP Property and Chordal Distance.

distance between fusion frame subspaces. As we calculate principle angles between subspaces of a Naimark complement fusion frame and compare them with the principle angles for the original fusion frame, we will correct this miscalculation.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we provide the required basic definitions in frame theory and develop the generalized Naimark complement. We also demonstrate some of its basic properties to show its similarity to the usual Naimark complement, and we note one significant difference. In section 3 we examine properties of a frame which carry over to the generalized Naimark complement. Finally, section 4 adapts the new generalized Naimark complement to the setting of fusion frames.

2. Construction of General Naimark Complements

We start with the basic definitions related to Hilbert space frames.

A family of vectors $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is called a *frame* for $\mathcal{H}_M$ if there are constants $0 < A \le B < \infty$ satisfying

$$A\|f\|^2 \le \sum_{n=1}^N |\langle f, f_n\rangle|^2 \le B\|f\|^2, \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{H}_M. \tag{1}$$

The numbers A, B are called *lower* and *upper frame bounds* of the frame respectively. If we only require the upper frame bound, we call this a $B-$*Bessel sequence*. If $A = B$ we call this an $A-$*tight frame*, and if $A = B = 1$, this is a *Parseval frame*. When we give the frame bounds A, B for a frame, we will assume they are the *optimal values*. That is A and B are the supremum and infimum respectively of all A's and B's satisfying (1). The *synthesis operator* is $F : \ell_2(N) \to \mathcal{H}_M$ given by $F(e_n) = f_n$, where $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is the natural orthonormal basis for $\ell_2(N)$ while the *analysis operator* of the frame is the operator $F^* : \mathcal{H}_M \to \ell_2(N)$ given by $F^*(f) = (\langle f, f_n\rangle)_{n=1}^N$. Finally, we have the frame operator $FF^* : \mathcal{H}_M \to \mathcal{H}_M$. That is,

$$FF^*(f) = \sum_{n=1}^N \langle f, f_n\rangle f_n, \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{H}_M.$$

This is a positive, self-adjoint, invertible operator on $\mathcal{H}_M$.

From the matrix point of view, the synthesis operator F is a matrix where the frame vectors form the columns:

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} | & | & \cdots & | \\ f_1 & f_2 & \cdots & f_N \\ | & | & \cdots & | \end{bmatrix}.$$

In terms of matrix completion, if F is an $M \times N$ Parseval frame, it can be extended by Naimark's theorem to an $N \times N$ unitary matrix by appending $(N - M)$ rows to F to obtain a unitary matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} F \\ G \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} | & | & \cdots & | \\ f_1 & f_2 & \cdots & f_N \\ | & | & \cdots & | \\ g_1 & g_2 & \cdots & g_N \\ | & | & \cdots & | \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this case, $G = \{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is the Naimark complement of F. We will make no distinction between frames $F = \{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$, $G = \{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ and their associated $M \times N$ and $(M - N) \times N$ synthesis matrices.

Given a Bessel sequence, we will construct a generalized Naimark complement by adding vectors to make the sequence a tight frame. We may then obtain a Parseval frame by scaling this tight frame; the Parseval frame has a usual Naimark complement. We obtain the general Naimark complement of the Bessel sequence by then re-scaling and ignoring the added vectors. We will make this precise, but first, let us recall the proof of Naimark's theorem.

Proof of Naimark's Theorem. Given a Parseval frame $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ for $\mathcal{H}_M$, the analysis operator $F^* : \mathcal{H}_M \to \ell_2(N)$ is the isometry

$$F^*f = (\langle f, f_1\rangle, \langle f, f_2\rangle, \cdots, \langle f, f_N\rangle).$$

Letting P be the orthogonal projection of $\ell_2(N)$ onto $F^*(\mathcal{H}_M)$, for any F^*f we have

$$\langle F^*f, Pe_n\rangle = \langle F^*f, e_n\rangle = \langle f, Fe_n\rangle = \langle f, f_n\rangle = \langle F^*f, F^*f_n\rangle.$$

It follows that $Pe_n = F^*f_n$. Since F^* is an isometry, we may identify f_n with F^*f_n, and this completes the proof. □

Our first step in defining the general Naimark complement is to complete a $B-$Bessel sequence into a $B-$tight frame by adding elements to the sequence. In order to accomplish this, we shall use a standard result from frame theory (Proposition 12 of [7]).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $F = \{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ be a frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$, $\{e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_M$, and $\{\lambda_m\}_{m=1}^M$ non-negative real numbers. The following are equivalent.*

(a) $\{e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ are eigenvectors of FF^* with respective eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m\}_{m=1}^M$.

(b) The matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \langle f_1, e_1\rangle & \langle f_2, e_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_1\rangle \\ \langle f_1, e_2\rangle & \langle f_2, e_2\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_2\rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle f_1, e_M\rangle & \langle f_2, e_M\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_M\rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

has orthogonal rows, and the square sum of the m^{th} row equals λ_m.

Theorem 2.1 provides and easy mechanism for completing a $B-$Bessel sequence to a $B-$tight frame; we simply add vectors colinear with eigenvectors of the frame operator to increase the smaller eigenvalues to equal the largest.

Theorem 2.2. *If $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is a $B-$Bessel sequence in $\mathcal{H}_M$, and its frame operator has eigenvectors $\{e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ with respective eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_K > \lambda_{K+1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_M \geq 0$, then there exist vectors $\{h_m\}_{m=K+1}^M$ so that $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N \bigcup \{h_j\}_{j=K+1}^M$ is a $\lambda_1 = B-$tight frame having eigenvectors $\{e_m\}_{m=1}^M$.*

Proof. Construct a matrix as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \langle f_1, e_1\rangle & \langle f_2, e_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_1\rangle & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \langle f_1, e_K\rangle & \langle f_2, e_K\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_K\rangle & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \langle f_1, e_{K+1}\rangle & \langle f_2, e_{K+1}\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_{K+1}\rangle & \sqrt{\lambda_1 - \lambda_{K+1}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle f_1, e_M\rangle & \langle f_2, e_M\rangle & \cdots & \langle f_N, e_M\rangle & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \sqrt{\lambda_1 - \lambda_M} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The result now follows from Theorem 2.1. In this case,

$$h_m = \sqrt{\lambda_1 - \lambda_m}\, e_m, \text{ for } m = K+1, K+2, \cdots, M.$$

□

Note in order to obtain a tight frame in $\mathcal{H}_M$, we add at most $M-1$ vectors to the frame. Also $M-K$ is the minimum number of vectors required to complete a Bessel sequence to a tight frame. Using the above construction, we may now define a general Naimark complement for any given frame or Bessel sequence.

Definition 2.3. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ be a $B-$Bessel sequence in $\mathcal{H}_M$ with a frame operator FF^* having eigenvectors $\{\varphi_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and respective eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m\}_{m=1}^M$. Choose K so that $B = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_K > \lambda_{K+1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_M$, and add $\{h_m\}_{m=K+1}^M$ to the Bessel sequence to make it a $\lambda_1 = B-$tight frame, where $h_m = \sqrt{B - \lambda_m}\, \varphi_m$ as in Theorem 2.2. Thus $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} f_n\}_{n=1}^N \cup \{\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} h_m\}_{m=K+1}^M$ is a Parseval frame, and by Naimark's theorem, there is a projection $P : \ell_2(N+M-K) \to \mathcal{H}_M$ with*

$$Pe_n = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} f_n & 1 \leq n \leq N \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} h_{K+\ell} & n = N+\ell, \qquad 1 \leq \ell \leq M-K \end{cases}$$

where $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{N+M-K}$ *is an orthonormal basis for* $\ell_2(N+M-K)$. *Then* $\{f_n \oplus \sqrt{B}(I-P)e_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is an orthogonal set with* $\|f_n \oplus \sqrt{B}(I-P)e_n\|^2 = B$ *for all* $n = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. *We call*

$$\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N =: \{\sqrt{B}(I-P)e_n\}_{n=1}^N$$

the Naimark complement of $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$.

With this definition in mind, notice if our original frame is a $B-$tight frame, then our Naimark complement is exactly equal to the usual Naimark complement. We formalize the properties of these general Naimark complements.

Theorem 2.4. *If* $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is a* $B-$*Bessel sequence in* $\mathcal{H}_M$, *the Naimark complement* $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *satisfies the following.*

(a) $\{f_n \oplus g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is an orthogonal set with* $\|f_n \oplus g_n\|^2 = B$.
(b) $\operatorname{span}(\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N) = \mathcal{H}_M^\perp \subset \mathcal{H}_{M+N-K}$.
(c) We have uniqueness in the sense that if $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is another Naimark complement so that* $\{f_n \oplus \psi_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is orthogonal with* $\|f_n \oplus \psi_n\|^2 = B$, *then* $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^N$ *is unitarily equivalent to* $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$.

Proof. Result (a) is clear by construction.

To show (b), consider the given frame in its synthesis matrix form

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} | & | & \cdots & | \\ f_1 & f_2 & \cdots & f_N \\ | & | & \cdots & | \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $H_1 = \{h_m\}_{m=K+1}^M$ be the vectors added to complete the frame so that $\begin{bmatrix} F & H_1 \end{bmatrix}$ is a $B-$tight frame. Choose a general Naimark complement G so that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F & H_1 \\ G & H_2 \end{bmatrix} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F' \\ G' \end{bmatrix}$$

is a $(N+M-K)\times(N+M-K)$ unitary matrix. Then the columns of G' span $\mathcal{H}_M^\perp$ in $\mathcal{H}_{N+M-K}$ and $\operatorname{rank}(G') = N-K$. We also have

$$I_{N+M-K} = \frac{1}{B}\begin{bmatrix} F^* & G^* \\ H_1^* & H_2^* \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} F & H_1 \\ G & H_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{B}\begin{bmatrix} F^*F + G^*G & 0 \\ 0 & H_1^*H_1 + H_2^*H_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

so that we have the Gram matrix $G^*G = BI_N - F^*F$. As this is diagonalizable,

$$G^*G = \begin{bmatrix} B-\lambda_1 & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & B-\lambda_M & & & \\ & & & B & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & B \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & & & & \\ & & & B-\lambda_{K+1} & & & & & \\ & & & & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & & & B-\lambda_M & & & \\ & & & & & & B & & \\ & & & & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & & & & B \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

This shows $\operatorname{rank}(G) = \operatorname{rank}(G^*G) = N - K = \operatorname{rank}(G')$. It follows that G and G' have the same column space, and thus $\operatorname{span}(\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N) = \mathcal{H}_M^\perp$ as a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{M+N-K}$.

Finally, to prove (c), note the families $\{f_n \oplus g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ and $\{f_n \oplus \psi_n\}_{n=1}^N$ are orthogonal bases for their spans with the squared norms of their vectors all equal to B. For all scalars $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^N$ we have

$$B\sum_{n=1}^N |a_n|^2 = \|\sum_{n=1}^N a_n f_n\|^2 + \|\sum_{n=1}^N a_n g_n\|^2,$$

and

$$B\sum_{n=1}^N \|a_n\|^2 = \|\sum_{n=1}^N a_n f_n\|^2 + \|\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \psi_n\|^2.$$

Hence, for all scalars $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^N$, we have

$$\|\sum_{n=1}^N a_n g_n\|^2 = \|\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \psi_n\|^2.$$

☐

Compared to Naimark complements of Parseval frames, the general Naimark complement has a key difference. Given a Parseval frame, its Naimark complement is a Parseval frame and therefore has frame bounds $A = B = 1$. For general Naimark complements, the frame bounds may be drastically different compared to those of the original frame; however, we can calculate these bounds based on the eigenvalues of the original frame operator.

Theorem 2.5. *If $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$ whose frame operator has eigenvalues $B = \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_K > \lambda_{K+1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_M = A$, then the Naimark complement is a frame with lower frame bound $B - \lambda_{K+1}$ and upper frame bound B if $N \neq M$, and upper frame bound $B - \lambda_M$ if $N = M$.*

Proof. This is immediate from equation (2) above. ☐

While the previous theorem shows that the general Naimark complement of a frame may not have a lower frame bound comparable to the lower frame bound of the original frame, a simple adjustment of the construction can produce complements with comparable lower bounds. Namely, instead of adding $M - K$ vectors to create a $B-$tight frame, add M vectors to produce a tight frame with a desired tight frame bound $C > B$. The same arguments show the complement now has upper frame bound C and lower frame bound $C - B$. Also, the results of Theorem 2.4 hold for this construction where we set $K = 0$. Naimark complements obtained by adding M vectors are not unitarily equivalent to complements when we add $M - K$ vectors however. Indeed (2) shows

$$\operatorname{rank}(G) = \begin{cases} N & \text{if } C > B \\ N - K & \text{if } C = B, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

so these Naimark complements do not even span the same space.

Further, recalling the analysis operator of a Parseval frame embeds our frame spanning $\mathcal{H}_M$ in a higher dimensional space, if we require our general Naimark complement to span $\mathcal{H}_M^\perp$, it is not possible to consider frame completions with any other number of vectors. That is, if we completed a $B-$Bessel sequence $F = \{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ to a $C-$tight frame by appending vectors $H = \{h_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$ and procede as in Theorem 2.4(b), then $\dim(\mathcal{H}_M^\perp) = N + L - M$ but (3) still holds. Thus for $C > B$ we must add $L = M$ vectors, and for $C = B$ we must add $L = M - K$ vectors as described in the original construction. For the remainder of this paper, we will consider complements constructed by adding the minimal number of extra vectors, $M - K$.

3. Properties of the Naimark Complement

In this section we will assume the given $B-$Bessel sequence has certain properties, and show how these properties carry over to the general Naimark complements.

Proposition 3.1. *Given a $B-$Bessel sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ for $\mathcal{H}_M$ with Naimark complement $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$, the following properties hold.*

(a) $\langle g_n, g_{n'}\rangle = -\langle f_n, f_{n'}\rangle$ for all $1 \le n \ne n' \le N$. In particular, if $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is an equiangular frame, so is $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$.
(b) If $J \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ and $\{f_n\}_{n\in J}$ is an orthogonal set, then so is $\{g_n\}_{n\in J}$.
(c) If $J \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ and $\{f_n\}_{n\in J}$ is an equal-norm set, then so is $\{g_n\}_{n\in J}$.

Proof. For (a), since $\{f_n \oplus g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is an orthogonal set, for all $1 \le n \ne n' \le N$ we have

$$0 = \langle f_n \oplus g_n, f_{n'} \oplus g_{n'}\rangle = \langle f_n, f_{n'}\rangle + \langle g_n, g_{n'}\rangle,$$

giving the result.

Now (b) is immediate from (a).

To prove (c), set $\|f_n\|= c$, for all $n \in J$. Then

$$1 = \frac{1}{B}(\|f_n\|^2+\|g_n\|^2)$$

so that $\|g_n\|^2= B - c^2$ for $n \in J$. □

Although we have shown the lower frame bound of the Naimark complement to not be controllable in general, we still are able to get optimal bounds for the restricted isometry property.

Definition 3.2. *A family of unit norm vectors $\{f_n\}_{n\in I}$ in $\mathcal{H}_M$ has the (L, δ)-restricted isometry property (RIP) if for every $J \subseteq I$, $|J| \le L$ and all scalars $\{a_n\}_{n\in J}$ we have*

$$(1-\delta)\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 \le \|\sum_{n\in J} a_n f_n\|^2 \le (1+\delta)\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 .$$

Theorem 3.3. *If $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is a frame with upper frame bound B, is $(L, \delta)-$RIP, and has general Naimark complement $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$, then $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{B-1}} g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is $(L, \frac{\delta}{B-1})-$RIP.*

Proof. Let $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ be the Naimark complement of $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$. Now, $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{B-1}} g_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is unit norm since $B = \|f_n \oplus g_n\|^2 = \|f_n\|^2 + \|g_n\|^2 = 1 + \|g_n\|^2$. For any $J \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ and any scalars $\{a_n\}_{n\in J}$, we have

$$B\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 = \|\sum_{n\in J} a_n f_n\|^2 + \|\sum_{n\in J} a_n g_n\|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sum_{n\in J} a_n g_n\|^2 &= B\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 - \|\sum_{n\in J} a_n f_n\|^2 \\ &\ge B\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 - (1+\delta)\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 \\ &= ((B-1)-\delta)\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 .\end{aligned}$$

Dividing through this inequality by $B-1$ yields

$$\|\sum_{n\in J} a_n \frac{g_n}{\sqrt{B-1}}\|^2 \ge \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{B-1}\right)\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2 .$$

Similarly,

$$\|\sum_{n\in J} a_n \frac{g_n}{\sqrt{B-1}}\|^2 \le \left(1 + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{B-1}}\right)\sum_{n\in J}|a_n|^2$$

completing the proof. □

4. Fusion Frames

We next consider general Naimark complements in terms of fusions frames. As every frame vector corresponds to a one-dimensional subspace, a frame operator may be viewed as a sum of weighted projections onto these one-dimensional subspaces. Fusion frames generalize this to subspaces of different dimensions. Specifically, let $\{W_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be subspaces of $\mathcal{H}_M$ and let $v_k > 0$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$ be positive weights. Then $\{W_k, v_k\}_{k=1}^K$ is a *fusion frame* for $\mathcal{H}_M$ if there are constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ so that

$$A\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K} \nu_k^2 \|P_k f\|^2 \leq B\|f\|, \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{H}_M,$$

where P_k is the orthogonal projection onto W_k. We call A, B the *fusion frame bounds*, and if $A = B = 1$, this is a *Parseval fusion frame.* The *fusion frame operator* $S : \mathcal{H}_M \to \mathcal{H}_M$ is then given by

$$Sf = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \nu_k^2 P_k f.$$

If we let $\{f_{kj}\}_{j=1}^{d_k}$ be any orthonormal basis for W_k and consider the frame $F = \{\nu_k f_{kj}\}_{k=1, j=1}^{K,\ d_j}$, notice that

$$Sf = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \nu_k^2 P_k f = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \nu_k^2 \langle f, f_{kj} \rangle f_{kj} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \langle f, \nu_k f_{kj} \rangle \nu_k f_{kj} = FF^* f.$$

This shows every fusion frame arises frame a standard frame where subspaces are represented by the spans of equal-norm, orthogonal sets. This leads to the definition of the Naimark complement for a fusion frame; we give the definition for our generalized version of this Naimark complement.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\{W_k, \nu_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be a fusion frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$ with frame bounds A, B. Choose orthonormal bases $\{f_{kj}\}_{j=1}^{d_k}$ for W_k, and consider the frame $\{v_k f_{kj}\}_{k=1, j=1}^{K,\ d_k}$ for $\mathcal{H}_M$. Construct the general Naimark complement $\{g_{kj}\}_{k=1, j=1}^{K,\ d_k}$ as in definition 2.3. Then for each $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$, $\{g_{kj}\}_{k=1}^{L_i}$ is an orthogonal set with norm $\sqrt{B - \nu_k^2}$. Set*

$$W_k' = \operatorname{span}\{g_{kj} : j = 1, 2, \cdots, d_k\}.$$

The Naimark complement fusion frame is then given by $\{W_k', \sqrt{B - \nu_k^2}\}_{k=1}^K$.

Note that we need to pick an orthonormal basis for W_k in order to get the Naimark complement subspace W_k', and thus it appears we may have many Naimark complements for any given fusion frame. However, all such complements are unitarily equivalent as we show in the next theorem. The proof is a version of an unpublished arguement of Jameson Cahill and Dustin Mixon which we use with their permission.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\{W_k, \nu_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be a fusion frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$ with frame bounds A, B and with Naimark complement fusion frames $\{W_k', \sqrt{B - v_k^2}\}_{k=1}^K$ and $\{Z_k', \sqrt{B - v_k^2}\}_{k=1}^K$. Then there exists a unitary operator $U : \mathcal{H}_M \to \mathcal{H}_M$ such that $UZ_k' = W_k'$ for all $k = 1, \cdots, K$.*

Proof. For each W_k, fix an orthonormal basis $\{f_{kj}\}_{j=1}^{d_k}$ and consider the frame $F = \{F_k\}_{k=1}^K = \{\nu_k f_{kj}\}_{k=1, j=1}^{K,\ d_k}$. Let $\{g_{kj}\}_{j=1}^{d_k}$ be a as in Definition 4.1 so that $G = \{G_k\}_{k=1}^K = \{g_{kj}\}_{k=1, j=1}^{K,\ d_k}$ is the Naimark complement of F with $\operatorname{span}(G_k) = W_k'$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} \begin{bmatrix} F & H \\ G & H' \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & F_2 & \cdots & F_K & H \\ G_1 & G_2 & \cdots & G_K & H' \end{bmatrix}$$

is a unitary matrix where H represents the vectors added to complete F to B-tight. Now suppose we choose a different orthonormal basis for each W_k. That is, let U_k be $d_k \times d_k$ unitary matrices, and consider the frame $F' = \{F_kU_k\}_{k=1}^K$. If we also consider $G' = \{G_kU_k\}_{k=1}^K$, notice

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F' & H \\ G' & H' \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F_1U_1 & \cdots & F_KU_K & H \\ G_1U_1 & \cdots & G_KU_K & H' \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F & H \\ G & H' \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} U_1 & & & & \\ & U_2 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & U_K & \\ & & & & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the matrix on the right is clearly unitary, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F' & H \\ G' & H' \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}\begin{bmatrix} F_1U_1 & F_2U_2 & \cdots & F_KU_K & H \\ G_1U_1 & G_2U_2 & \cdots & G_KU_K & H' \end{bmatrix}$$

is also a unitary matrix. Thus G' is a Naimark complement of F'. Further $\text{span}(G_kU_k) = \text{span}(G_k) = W_k'$ for all $k = 1, \cdots, K$.

Now given any Naimark fusion frame $\{Z_k', \sqrt{B-\nu_k^2}\}_{k=1}^K$, this arises from a Naimark complement $\{z_{kj}\}_{k=1,j=1}^{K,\ d_k}$ of a frame of the form F', where $Z_k' = \text{span}(\{z_{kj}\}_{j=1}^{d_k})$. By Theorem 2.4(c), every Naimark complement of F' is unitarily equivalent to G'. Thus, there exists some unitary operator U such that

$$UZ_k' = \text{span}(G_kU_k) = W_k'.$$

□

There are many ways to measure the distance between two subspaces of a Hilbert space. The most exact measure comes from the *principal angles*. Intuitively we find two unit norm vectors (one in each subspace) which are the closest and take the angle formed between them. Then we consider the orthogonal complements of these vectors in their respective subspaces, and find the closest two unit norm vectors in these subspaces. We continue in this manner until one of the orthogonal complements is empty. The formal definition follows. For notation, if W is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_M$, we write $S_W = \{f \in W : \|f\| = 1\}$.

Definition 4.3. *Given two subspaces W_1, W_2 of $\mathcal{H}_M$ with dim $W_1 = d_1 \leq$ dim $W_2 = d_2$, the* principal angles *$(\theta_1, \theta_2, \cdots \theta_{d_1})$ between the subspaces are defined as*

$$\theta_1 = \min\{\arccos\langle f, g\rangle : f \in S_{W_1}, g \in S_{W_2}\}.$$

Two vectors f_1, g_1 are called principal vectors *if they give the minimum above. The remaining principal angles and vectors are defined recursively via*

$$\theta_j = \min\{\arccos\ \langle f, g\rangle : f \in S_{W_1}, g \in S_{W_2},\ \textit{and}\ f \perp f_\ell, g \perp g_\ell, 1 \leq \ell \leq j-1.\}$$

Now we will consider how principal angles are passed from a fusion frame to the general Naimark fusion frame. To accomplish this, we will use the following theorem which we prove for Parseval frames.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\{W_k, \nu_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be a Parseval fusion frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$ with $\dim W_k = d$ for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$, and let $\{W_k', \sqrt{1-\nu_k^2}\}_{k=1}^K$ be its Naimark complement. Fix two subspaces, say W_1, W_1, and suppose $\{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^d$ are the associated principle angles. Let $N = dK$, and assume the frame been embedded into $\ell_2(N)$ (see the proof of Naimark's theorem) with P the orthogonal projection of $\ell_2(N)$ onto $\mathcal{H}_M$. Now choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{kj}\}_{k=1,j=1}^{K\ \ d}$ for $\ell_2(N)$ which satisfies*

(a) $\{\frac{1}{\nu_k}Pe_{kj}\}_{k=1}^K$ are the principle vectors for W_1, W_2,
(b) $W_k = \text{span}\{Pe_{kj}\}_{j=1}^d$, for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$.

Then the complementary fusion frame subspaces W_1', W_2' have principle vectors $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_k^2}}(I-P)e_{kj}\}_{j=1}^d$ and principle angles

$$\{\theta_j'\}_{j=1}^d = \left\{\arccos\left[\frac{\nu_1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_1^2}}\frac{\nu_2}{\sqrt{1-\nu_2^2}}\cos(\theta_j)\right]\right\}_{j=1}^d.$$

Proof. We will find the first principle vectors and associated principal angle between W_1' and W_2'; the result will follow by iteration of the argument. To identify the first principal vectors we need to maximize

$$\{\langle f, g\rangle : f \in S_{W_1'}, g \in S_{W_2'}\}.$$

That is, we need to maximize

$$\left\langle \sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{a_j}{\sqrt{1-\nu_1^2}}(I-P)e_{1j}, \sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{b_j}{\sqrt{1-\nu_2^2}}(I-P)e_{2j} \right\rangle, \tag{4}$$

subject to the constraints $\sum_{j=1}^{d} |a_j|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{d} |b_j|^2 = 1$. From equation (4), we need to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_1^2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_2^2}}\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j\overline{b_j}\langle (I-P)e_{j1}, (I-P)e_{j2}\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_1^2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_2^2}}\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j\overline{b_j}\langle Pe_{1j}, Pe_{2j}\rangle \\ &= -\frac{\nu_1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_1^2}}\frac{\nu_2}{\sqrt{1-\nu_2^2}}\left\langle \sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{a_j}{\nu_1}Pe_{1j}, \frac{b_j}{\nu_2}Pe_{2j}\right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

However, since $\{\frac{1}{\nu_k}Pe_{jk}\}_{j=1}^{d}$, $k = 1, 2$, are the principle vectors for W_1, W_2, the maximum in equation (5) is precisely

$$\frac{\nu_1}{\sqrt{1-\nu_1^2}}\frac{\nu_2}{\sqrt{1-\nu_2^2}}\cos(\theta_1).$$

We complete the proof by observing that the inner product below yields precisely this value:

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v_1^2}}(I-P)e_{11}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v_2^2}}(I-P)e_{21} \right\rangle.$$

Hence these are the principal vectors. □

Note it is not necessary to have subspaces of equal dimension since the same proof works in complete generality. Further, if we consider any fusion frame $\{W_k, \nu_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$ with fusion frame bounds A, B and take orthonormal bases for each subspace weighted by the ν_k, this is a frame with frame bounds A, B. Completing to a B-tight frame and normalizing by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}}$, this becomes a Parseval frame giving a Naimark complement which is also fusion frame. Theorem 4.4 now applies so that by replacing ν_k by $\frac{\nu_k}{\sqrt{B}}$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\{W_k, \nu_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$ be a fusion frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$ with $\dim W_k = d_k$ for each $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$ and upper frame bound B. Let $\{W_k', \sqrt{B-\nu_k^2}\}_{k=1}^{K}$ be a Naimark complement fusion frame. Fix subspaces, say W_1, W_2 where $d_1 \le d_2$, and suppose $\{\theta_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{d_1}$ are the associated principal angles. Then the principal angles for the subspaces W_1', W_2' are*

$$\left\{ \arccos\left[\frac{\nu_1}{\sqrt{B-\nu_1^2}}\frac{\nu_2}{\sqrt{B-\nu_2^2}}\cos(\theta_\ell) \right] \right\}_{\ell=1}^{d_1}.$$

Another measure of distance between subspaces of a Hilbert space is the *chordal distance*, so named as it can be expressed as a multiple of the straight line distance between projection matrices living on a sphere. This distance is closely related to fusion frames with maximal resilience to noise and erasures [11]. While there are several equivalent forms for this distance, as we have already calculated principle angles for Naimark fusion frames, we will use the following form from (5.4) in [9].

Definition 4.6. *If W_1, W_2 are subspaces of $\mathcal{H}_M$ of dimension d, the* chordal distance $d_c(W_1, W_2)$ *between the subspaces is given by*

$$d_c^2(W_1, W_2) = d - tr[P_1 P_2] = d - \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \cos^2 \theta_\ell,$$

where P_k is the orthogonal projection onto W_k, $k = 1, 2$, and $\{\theta_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^d$ are the principal angles for W_1, W_2.

Using Corollary 4.5, we can correct Theorem 3.6 of [2] which computes the chordal distances for the Naimark complement of a Parseval fusion frame incorrectly.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\{W_k, v_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be a fusion frame for $\mathcal{H}_M$ with upper frame bound B, and let $\{W_k', \sqrt{1-\nu_k^2}\}_{k=1}^K$ be a Naimark fusion frame. Fix two subspaces, say W_1, W_2. Then*

$$d_c^2(W_1', W_2') = \left[1 - \frac{\nu_1^2}{1-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{1-\nu_2^2}\right] d + \left[\frac{\nu_1^2}{1-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{1-\nu_2^2}\right] d_c^2(W_1, W_2).$$

Proof. Using Corollary 4.5 we perform the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} d_c^2(W_1', W_2') &= d - \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \frac{\nu_1^2}{B-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{B-\nu_2^2} \cos^2 \theta_\ell \\ &= d - \left[\frac{\nu_1^2}{B-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{B-\nu_2^2}\right] \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \cos^2 \theta_\ell \\ &= d - \left[\frac{\nu_1^2}{B-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{B-\nu_2^2}\right] \left[d - d_c^2(W_1, W_2)\right] \\ &= \left[1 - \frac{\nu_1^2}{B-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{B-\nu_2^2}\right] d + \left[\frac{\nu_1^2}{B-\nu_1^2}\frac{\nu_2^2}{B-\nu_2^2}\right] d_c^2(W_1, W_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Casazza/Smalyanau were supported by NSF DMS 1008183, NSF ATD 1042701, and AFOSR FA9550-11-1-0245. Fickus was supported by NSF DMS 1042701, NSF CCF 1017278, AFOSR F1ATA00083G004 and AFOSR F1ATA00183G003. Mixon was supported by the A.B. Krongard Fellowship.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Cahill and P. G. Casazza, *The Paulsen problem in operator theory*, preprint arXiv:1102.2344v2.

[2] R. Calderbank, P.G. Casazza, A. Heinecke, G. Kutyniok and A. Pezeshki, *Sparse fusion frames: Existence and construction*, Adv. Comput. Math. **35** (2011) 1-31.

[3] P. G. Casazza and M. Fickus, *Minimizing fusion frame potential*, Acta. Appl. Math **107** No. 103 (2009), 724.

[4] P.G. Casazza, M. Fickus, D. Mixon, Y. Wang and Z. Zhou, *Constructing tight fusion frames*, Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis **30**, 175-187 (2011).

[5] P.G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok, *Frames of subspaces*, Contemporary Math, **345**, 87-114(2004).

[6] P. G. Casazza, G. Kutyniok, and S. Li, *Fusion frames and distributed processing*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **25** No. 1 (2008), 114-132.

[7] P.G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok, *Introduction to finite frame theory*, in Finite Frame Theory, Eds. P.G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok, Birkhuser, Boston (2012).

[8] O. Christensen, *An introduction to frames and Riesz bases*, Birkhauser, Boston (2003).

[9] J. H. Conway, R. H. Hardin, and N. J. A. Sloane, Packing lines, planes, etc.: packings in Grassmannian spaces, Experiment. Math., vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 139-159, (1996).

[10] M. Fickus, D. Mixon, and J. Tremain, *Steiner equiangular tight frames*, Linear Algebra and Applications **436** no. 5 1014-1027 (2012).

[11] G. Kutyniok, A. Pezeshki, A.R. Calderbank, and T. Liu, Robust Dimension Reduction, Fusion Frames, and Grassmannian Packings. Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. 26, 6476 (2009)

CASAZZA/PETERSON/SMALYANAU: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO 65211-4100
E-mail address: `Casazzap@missouri.edu; jdpq6c@mail.missouri.edu; ivsvhd@mizzou.edu`